

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-16 and 19-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 19, and 20 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated July 26, 2007, Claim 10 was objected to, Claims 5, 7, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, and Claims 1-16 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 3-16 and 19-20 remain in this application with Claim 2 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant hereby addresses the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant thanks Examiners Wong and Hong for the courtesy of a telephone interview on September 12, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Objection to Claim 10

In the Final Office Action dated July 26, 2007, the Examiner objected to Claim 10 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Claim 10 has been amended to address this informality and does not narrow the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this objection and adds no new matter.

III. Rejection of Claim 5, 7, and 12-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 5, 7, and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 1 has been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0137539 ("Dees") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,828 ("Burkett"). Claims 1, 19, and 20 have been amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "storing a view definition file separate from the menu definition file, the view definition file comprising data describing how the menu should appear when displayed and menu layout data comprising an items component specifying an area, a screen inside of which content is to be displayed and including at least one of the following: an item layout, a focus layout, and pagination data."

Amended Claims 19 and 20 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 10, lines 17-27.

In contrast, *Dees* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Dees* merely discloses a storage medium comprising a user interface definition document, a first style sheet document, and a second style sheet document. (See paragraph [0035].) *Dees* further discloses that it is common to provide style information for abstract elements, including user interface elements, by specifying one or more so-called properties for those elements. (See paragraph [0038].) A graphical element's color (a "widget") is a property, as is its font, the X- and Y-coordinates on the screen. (See paragraph [0038].) The user interface as a whole also has properties (e.g. its layout, default fonts, a background color or image, etc). (See paragraph [0038].) A style sheet document in *Dees* then provides values for one or more of these properties. (See paragraph [0038].) Consequently, *Dees* merely discloses style sheets for defining property values such as fonts, colors, and images. Accordingly, *Dees* does not disclose menu layout data comprising an items component including an item layout, a focus layout, or pagination data. Rather *Dees* is silent regarding item layout, focus layout, and pagination data.

Furthermore, *Burkett* does not overcome *Dees*' deficiencies. *Burkett* merely discloses building and displaying dynamic graphical user interfaces (GUIs) that can be updated automatically without requiring code modification and recompiling. (See col. 1, lines 39-42.) In *Burkett*, an Extensible Markup Language (XML) data group is selected from a plurality of XML data groups in response to a request to display a particular GUI on a computer display. (See col. 1, lines 42-45.) *Burkett*'s selected XML data group includes one or more data aggregations (groups) hierarchically ordered within the selected XML data group. (See col. 1, lines 45-47.) *Burkett*'s XML data items are

hierarchically ordered within the data aggregations. (See col. 1, lines 47-49.)

Consequently, *Burkett* merely discloses XML data groups having one or more data aggregations being selected to display a GUI. Accordingly, *Dees* does not disclose menu layout data comprising an items component including an item layout, a focus layout, or pagination data. Rather *Dees* is silent regarding item layout, focus layout, and pagination data.

Combining *Dees* with *Burkett* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Dees* and *Burkett*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "storing a view definition file separate from the menu definition file, the view definition file comprising data describing how the menu should appear when displayed and menu layout data comprising an items component specifying an area, a screen inside of which content is to be displayed and including at least one of the following: an item layout, a focus layout, and pagination data," as recited by amended Claim 1. Independent Claims 19 and 20 each includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 19, and 20 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1, 19, and 20.

Dependent Claims 3-16 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 3-16.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: September 26, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:ARL:mdc

